| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | 10/802,908 | REITER ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Geoffrey L. Knable | 1733 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: <u>allowable</u> | | |
| (1) <u>Geoffrey L. Knable</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) Henry C. Young, Jr. | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: <u>17 February 2006</u> | Time: <u>10:30a</u> | • |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: n/a | | |
| Claims discussed: | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: n/a | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet | | |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability: Part II above. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| Holly L. Clille | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/) | Applicant's Representative Signature | anature – if appropriate) |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreement was reached on the changes detailed on the attached examiner's amendment in order to place this application into condition for allowance. The removal of the "preferably" clauses was to avoid an issue of indefiniteness in that it was not clear if these more narrow definitions were to limit the claim scope. The removal of the material in parentheses in claim 10 was to avoid an issue of indefiniteness in that it was not clear if this material was intended to further limit the claim. The other changes avoid minor antecedent ambiguities while the new claims cover the subject matter of the deleted "preferably" clauses that were not already covered by other claims.